



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,222	06/01/2006	Bart Gerard Bernard Barenbrug	348162-982820	1685
94518	7590	12/21/2010	EXAMINER	
DLA PIPER LLP (US)			MEROUAN, ABDERRAHIM	
2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE				
EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/21/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/581,222	BARENBRUG ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN	2628

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 06 December 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-13.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 12/06/2010

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Andrew Wang/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628

/A. M./  
 Examiner, Art Unit 2628

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument for claim 1, applicant argues on page 7 that the prior art Deering does not disclose: "a rasterizer configured to traverse a surface grid over a surface of a primitive of a 3D image for all of the plurality of different views of said 3D image such that traversing is performed once for said 3D image." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Deering stated that: "...filtering engine 106 may scan through virtual screen space in raster fashion..." see Deering, Page 8, Paragraph[0110], and "...The 3D graphics data may comprise a stream of graphics primitives..." see Deering, Page 4, Paragraph[0050].

A raster fashion is a rasterization that is applied to a 3D image data the data could be a stream of many different view of the 3D image through a computational pipeline to be rendered once." The rendering engine may send primitives through a computational pipeline (or partition the primitives among a number of parallel pipelines) to render the primitives in terms of samples." Deering, Page2, Paragraph[0020]..

In response to applicant's argument for claim 1, applicant argues on page 7 that the prior art Deering does not disclose: "a shader unit configured to determine a color of the output of the rasterizer and forward a shaded color sample along with its screen coordinates." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Deering stated that: "(Deering, Pages 4-5, Paragraph [0056], lines 1-13 "rendering engine... compute color information..." In this case the rendering engine is the shader unit."), and (Deering, Page 3. Paragraph [0027], lines 1-8 "the positions are in a two-dimensional field which are the screen coordinates.").

Deering discloses a rasterization that receives or forward the stream of 3d image data from a shader. For example a rasterizer gets the output of a vertex shader and a pixel shader gets the output of the rasterizer. Deering discloses the rendering engine that includes shader unit , and rasterizer.

In response to applicant's argument for claim 1, applicant argues on page 8 that the prior art Deering does not disclose: "a plurality of screen space resamplers, each of said screen space resamplers being configured to resample the shaded color sample determined by said shader unit according to one of the plurality of different views such that resampling is performed a plurality of times in parallel for said 3D image." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Deering stated that: "the supersamples are generated by resamplers (rendring engine and filtering engine)." (Deering, Page 4, Paragraph [0037], lines 1-3 and, Page 3, Paragraph [0027], lines 1-8, and "...filtering engine 106 may scan through virtual screen space in raster fashion..." see Deering, Page 8, Paragraph[0110]. The filter engine resample the sample to get supersample.

In response to applicant's argument for claim 9, the response used for claim is the same used for claim 9.